



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/757,551

01/15/2004

Orhun K. Muratoglu

37697-0085

3038

61263

7590

12/12/2006

PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE, N.W.,
SUITE 400 SOUTH
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

STAICOVICI, STEFAN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1732

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/757,551

Applicant(s)

MURATOGLU ET AL.

Examiner

Stefan Staicovici

Art Unit

1732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 and 80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-77 and 80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicants' amendment filed September 29, 2006 has been entered. Claims 1-77 and 80 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 5-19, 21-35, 38-42, 45-49, 52-55, 57, 59-62, 64-72 and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidgren *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,448,315) in view of Hahn (US Patent No. 5,827,904).

Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach the basic process for making a medical implant including, providing UHMWPE powder, mixing said powder with vitamin E (antioxidant) to reduce oxidation, irradiating said mixture with radiation, compression molding said irradiated mixture into said medical implant or machining medical implants from compression molded blocks of said irradiated mixture, packaging said medical implant and sterilizing said package (see col. 4, line 45 through col. 5, line 10 and col. 5, line 66 through col. 6, line 8). Further, it is submitted that Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach reducing the free radicals and irradiating said mixture to cross-link the PE chains, hence controlling the amount of free radicals by irradiation and antioxidant

amount. It is noted that a medical implant must be oxidation and wear resistant in order to function as described. The purpose of vitamin E is to create an oxidation resistant product, hence it is submitted that the medical implant of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) is oxidation resistant in order to function as described. The purpose of using UHMWPE, which has large molecular weight, is to create a product that is wear resistant, hence it is submitted that the medical implant of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) is wear resistant in order to function as described. Furthermore, it is submitted that the medical implant of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) is sterile in order to function as a medical implant.

Regarding claims 1, 34-35, 41-42, 48-49, 55, 62 and 77, although Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach doping a polymeric material (powder) with an antioxidant (vitamin E), Lidgren *et al.* ('315) do not teach doping a consolidated polymeric material with an antioxidant by diffusion. Hahn ('904) teaches a process for making a medical implant by either consolidating a polymeric material (UHMWPE) and doping said consolidated polymeric material with an antioxidant or as an equivalent alternative, doping said polymeric material and then consolidating said doped, polymeric material (see col. 3, lines 15-20 and col. 7, lines 24-47). Hahn ('904) teaches that both methods provide for antioxidant material to be present in the final, consolidated product. Further, Hahn ('904) teaches soaking said consolidated polymeric material in an antioxidant solution such that the soaking time, temperature and solution strength determine the doping level (see col. 3, lines 29-35). It is submitted that upon soaking said consolidated polymeric material in an antioxidant solution the laws of diffusion apply such that the antioxidant solution diffuses into the said consolidated polymeric material. Hence, it is submitted that based upon Fick's Laws on diffusion a gradient of antioxidant is formed in the consolidated polymeric material. Therefore, it

would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have doped a consolidated polymeric material as an equivalent alternative to doping the polymeric material as taught by Hahn ('904) in the process of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) because, Hahn ('904) teaches that such process step sequences are equivalent alternatives and also because both references teach the same polymeric material, UHMWPE, and the same end-product (medical implant). Furthermore, it is submitted that the medical implant of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) is sterile in order to function as a medical implant and also because Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) teach treating UHMWPE with gamma radiation.

In regard to claims 5-7, 38-40, 45-47, 52-54, 59-61 and 65-67, Hahn ('904) teaches soaking said consolidated polymeric material in an antioxidant solution such that the soaking time, temperature and solution strength determine the doping level (see col. 3, lines 29-35). Hence, it is submitted that soaking time, temperature and solution strength are result-effective variables. In re Antonie, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have doped a consolidated polymeric material as an equivalent alternative to doping the polymeric material as taught by Hahn ('904) in the process of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) because, Hahn ('904) specifically teaches that such process step sequences are equivalent alternatives and also because both references teach the same polymeric material, UHMWPE, and the same end-product (medical implant).

Specifically regarding claims 8 and 68, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach annealing at a temperature above the melting temperature of the consolidated polymeric material (see col. 6, lines 8-18).

Regarding claims 9-10, 12, 30-31, 69-70 and 72, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach UHMWPE (polyolefin) powder and an antioxidant (vitamin E, alpha-tocopherol) (see Abstract).

In regard to claims 11 and 71, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach a medical implant for a joint replacement, specifically a femoral component (see col. 1, lines 13-16 and 50-55).

Specifically regarding claims 13-19, 21-26, 57 and 64, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach gamma radiation of 3.3-100 Mrad in air and an inert atmosphere, *i.e.* nitrogen gas (fluid) and, remelting the irradiated polymer in a non-oxidative atmosphere, *i.e.* inert or vacuum (1% oxygen) to reduce the free radicals (see col. 2, lines 13-55).

Regarding claim 27, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach the use of a solvent (ethanol) (see col. 3, lines 10-15).

In regard to claims 28-29, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach diffusion of an antioxidant in a supercritical fluid such as, CO₂ (see col. 4, lines 62-65).

Specifically regarding claims 32-33, it is noted that the limitation are functional limitations. In a claim drawn to a process of making, it is the structure that carries patentability and not the functional limitation. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have made a non-permanent medical device, such as a tubing using the process of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) because, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teaches that the doped UHMWPE provides for improved properties that enhance the material's use a biological material, hence providing for an improved product such as a catheter or a non-permanent medical device.

4. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidgren *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,448,315) in view of Hahn (US Patent No. 5,827,904) and in further view of Parth *et al.* (2002) (referenced as A11 in the IDS filed 7/16/2004).

Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claim 20, although Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) teach treating UHMWPE with gamma radiation, Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) do not teach e-beam radiation. However, the use of e-beam radiation as an equivalent alternative to gamma radiation (see Abstract and Conclusions) is well known as evidenced by Parth *et al.* (2002). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill to have used e-beam radiation as an equivalent alternative to gamma radiation as taught by Parth *et al.* (2002) to treat UHMWPE in the process of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) because, Parth *et al.* (2002) specifically teach the use of e-beam radiation as an equivalent alternative to gamma radiation and also because all references teach similar materials and end-products.

5. Claims 3-4, 36-37, 43-44, 50-51, 56, 58, 63 and 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidgren *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,448,315) in view of Hahn (US Patent No. 5,827,904) and in further view of Burstein *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,620,198).

Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claims 3-4, 36-37, 43-44, 50-51, 56, 58, 63, 73-75, although Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach a metallic/UHMWPE component (see col. 1, lines 14-20), Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in

view of Hahn ('904) do not teach compression molding a metallic/UHMWPE component. Burstein *et al.* ('198) teach compression molding a polymer element (140) (UHMWPE) and a metallic element (130) to form a medical component (see col. 5, lines 1-10). It is submitted that a metallic/UHMWPE component includes a metal/polymer interface. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have compression molded a polymer element and a metallic element as taught by Burstein *et al.* ('198) to form a medical component by the process of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) because, Burstein *et al.* ('198) teach that a metallic/polymer interface provides for an improved product having improved biological properties and also because Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach a metallic/UHMWPE component (see col. 1, lines 14-20), hence teaching the desirability of a metallic/polymer interface.

6. Claims 76 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lidgren *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,448,315) in view of Hahn (US Patent No. 5,827,904) and in further view of Burstein *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,620,198) and Ylanen *et al.* (US Patent No. 6,517,857 B2).

Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) and in further view of Burstein *et al.* ('198) teach the basic claimed process as described above.

Regarding claims 76 and 80, although Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach a metallic/UHMWPE component (see col. 1, lines 14-20), Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) and in further view of Burstein *et al.* ('198) do not teach compression molding a metallic/ceramic component. Ylanen *et al.* ('857) teach that polymers, metals and ceramic are all alternative materials for making a medical component. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have compression molded a ceramic element (non-metallic) and a metallic element to

form a ceramic/metallic interface by the process of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn ('904) and in further view of Burstein *et al.* ('198) and Ylanen *et al.* ('857) because, Ylanen *et al.* ('857) specifically teach that polymers, metals and ceramic are all alternative materials for making a medical component, whereas Lidgren *et al.* ('315) teach a medical component.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicants' remarks filed September 29, 2006 have been considered.
8. Applicants argue that the art of record does not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the formation of a "gradient of antioxidant in the consolidated polymeric material" (see pages 13-14 of the amendment filed 9/29/2006). Further, Applicants specifically argue that Lidgren *et al.* ('315) does not teach a gradient of antioxidant because Lidgren *et al.* ('315) requires mixing of UHMWPE powder/particles with an antioxidant prior to consolidation" (see page 14 of the amendment filed 9/29/2006). In response, it is first noted, that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981) and In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Secondly, as shown throughout prosecution of the instant application, Hahn ('904) specifically teaches a process for making a medical implant by either consolidating a polymeric material (UHMWPE) and doping said consolidated polymeric material with an antioxidant or, as an equivalent alternative, doping said polymeric material and then consolidating said doped, polymeric material (see col. 3, lines 15-20 and col. 7, lines 24-47). Therefore, because the process of Lidgren *et al.* ('315) in view of Hahn

('904) teaches soaking a consolidated polymeric material in an antioxidant solution, it is submitted that the laws of diffusion apply such that the antioxidant solution diffuses into the said consolidated polymeric material. That is, based upon Fick's Laws on diffusion, a gradient of antioxidant is formed in the consolidated polymeric material because said consolidated polymeric material is soaked in said antioxidant solution.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Conclusion


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefan Staicovici, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1208. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stefan Staicovici, PhD


Primary Examiner 12/7/06

AU 1732

December 7, 2006